



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PACIFIC SPIRIT OF THE PRESS.

The periodical press has of late teemed with so many able and pertinent articles on Peace, that we can copy only a fraction of what has been published since the date of our last number. The religious press has published by far the most; but we can find room only for extracts from a few *secular* papers, as specimens of what our most intelligent, practical men are fast coming to think on this great subject.

PROGRESS OF PEACE PRINCIPLES.—There is in the church-yard of a neighboring town a grave-stone on which is chiseled “He was a Christian and a Warrior”—nor do we deem this wrong or absurd in the popular use of the word “Christian.” This term is not used to denote a perfect man, who is thoroughly and altogether imbued with the spirit of Christ. It means one who seeks to know his duty and is resolved to follow out in his conduct the teachings of the Saviour as he understands them. We doubt not that very many warriors have been actuated by high and holy motives and were as conscientious in the use of the sword, as the advocates of peace in the use of the pen.

We have adverted to this inscription to show the change in public opinion on the subject of war. When this stone was set up—some fifty years since—it accorded with the common tone. The inscription was not considered in bad taste, it excited no remark, did not convey any idea of incongruity—did not strike the reader as the joining together of things opposite to their nature. Now who can take into the mind at once, the self-sacrificing spirit of the Prince of Peace and the martial-spirit, destroying men for its own good, and not feel, that the one is of Heaven, the other from the lusts and passions of men? Who would not shudder to have the print of a battle in the leaves of the New Testament, or to see cast upon the metal of the cannon, “Love your enemy?” The stoutest advocate for war now is not exactly satisfied with the words Christian and warrior placed before him in so close connection, that the mind must drink in the opposite ideas at one and the same time. He would require some space between them—some separating word that he might turn from the one to the other. He was a Christian though a warrior, would strike the eye much more pleasantly.

One point is therefore gained for peace. Fighting which once was believed to be supported, nay, commanded by our faith, is now supposed to be only tolerated by it, and this from the necessity of the case. This is all which public opinion will now yield to the warrior, all which the warrior claims, and this half apology for the battle, is spoken as it were in a whisper; it is not boldly and forcibly spoken as a settled and acknowledged truth.

We remember at a public discussion on the subject of war, when, the lawfulness of war was attempted to be proved by the Scriptures, to have heard an advocate of war on the ground of the necessity of the case, remark that for his part it made his heart sink within him to hear the gospel quoted as an apology for war. This is public opinion to a great extent.—*Portsmouth Journal.*

EFFORTS IN BEHALF OF PEACE.—Perhaps one can scarcely be found so sanguine, as to imagine that all wars may for the future be avoided. Reasons compels us to contemplate the probability of their

actual occurrence. When we think that individuals and political parties, seeking to acquire or to retain power, may urge their countrymen into war, when we think that want of skill, excess of passion, in a diplomatist, is a fruitful cause of war, that in some countries military men seek war as the only means of distinction, and that in some, nations are impelled to war by their rulers to employ an idle population, to turn the minds of people from scanning the vices of government, and even to sweep off a turbulent excess of population, whose rulers cannot find them bread, without surrendering their own long enjoyed possessions—we cannot, at the present day, believe wars impossible. We, who are the people, are, alas, still the sport of our rulers; and I shudder, when, as an individual, I think that every thing which I hold dear on earth may be held as a forfeit to the caprice of rulers, and of a people who believe they must fight.

WAR NOT NECESSARY.—Is it possible that the world is so ill-arranged, that the heart of man and the course of Providence are so ill-contrived, that men cannot exist, that men cannot enjoy life, except upon the condition that every few years they must murder one another by scores, or by the hundred thousand? Are murder, rapine, lust, the most furious, the most demoniacal passions, the keenest miseries, which can rack the human frame, and desolate the spirit, *necessary* to carry out the purposes of a wise Providence, in the government of nations? I reply, if we are infidels, we may believe in the abstract necessity of war. If, on the other hand, we have those kindly sentiments in the heart, which persuade us of the existence, and lead us to adore the perfections of a Being infinitely wise and good, we must come to an unutterably deep conviction, that man alone is answerable for the horrors of war, that it lies in his power, that it is his duty to put an end to international war. Believe that man may control the evil passions of man, believe that wisdom will be granted to man, as one of the necessities of existence, as fast as he awakes to feel the want of it, and such a faith involves the faith also that it is in our power to put an end to war.

It must be done! If tyrants have hitherto used us as the sport of their passions, and have doomed us to destruction to satiate their lusts, we must now teach them that we are too precious to be sacrificed as worthless. Man is not by his birth a murderer. There is room in the world for all of us. There are means of life richly furnished to all who are compelled to draw the breath of existence. Let us live together; let us determine that we will live in peace; and let us understand, too, that peace may be preserved with national honor and with national justice.

CAUSES FAVORABLE TO PEACE.—Many general causes are now in operation, to which I need not allude, since all the world knows them, to bring about a condition of permanent peace among nations. Much dependence is to be placed upon the influence of trade and commerce to unite nations in bonds of friendship. Much is to be placed upon the fact that Lyons starves, if France goes to war, and Birmingham and Lowell must be ruined, if England and America fight. A million hungry operatives in Manchester, Sheffield and Preston, constitute an insecure basis, on which to rest, while engaging in the game of war. But while commerce and economy, while the gradual diffusion of intelligence and Christian principles are demonstrating the folly of war, and compelling governments to peace, the Christian mind cannot but be-

lieve that causes may be put in operation, not yet at work, or that those now in operation, may be accelerated, so as to hasten on the period of permanent international peace. Is war foolish? Let the *world* see and understand its folly. Is war unnecessary to defend right and vindicate honor? Show to the world at large, and let not the conviction be shut up in private breasts, that justice and honor may be preserved without recourse to war. Is war unchristian and Christianity true? Then, let the world see that its practice and its principles have been at variance; and let us generally proclaim that we will put an end to wars, or else let us proclaim the wisdom of infidelity.

SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR.—Many disputed questions have heretofore been settled by arbitration. Kings and princes have wisely, benevolently, honorably availed themselves of the power, conferred by their stations, to intercede for peace between contending nations. May not one further step be made beyond the royal domain, for the purpose of discovering and establishing justice? As a nation, we send commissioners to our north-eastern boundary, to discover the naked truth; we do not, as a nation, count ourselves degraded by entrusting the discovery of truth to private minds; three hundred years ago many a government, in such circumstances, would have considered its honor tarnished, by attempts to inquire for the truth, and most of all by using private men for its discovery. As a nation, again, we often appear in the courts of our country, and the meanest citizen is allowed to plead before private men his cause against his country. Yet as a nation, we do not feel degraded if Taney, and Story, and Marshall decide that we have done wrong, and compel us to do right. Why, then, I ask, may not *two* nations, involved in difficulty, appeal, not to heads which wear crowns for their blood's sake and not for their wisdom, but to those whose only crown is the wisdom with which heaven endowed them, and the learning and virtues which they have acquired? Nations would not demean themselves, they would show themselves honorable, by appointing a commission of men, distinguished and able, chosen from some other people than their own, to decide wherein lay the right. There are men in the world worthy to be chosen for such a purpose; a nation best defends its honor before the world, when it rejects its present interests as a rule of conduct, and takes reasonable means to discover what is right.—*Boston Courier.*

SPECULATIONS ON WAR AND PEACE.—"We find in the *National Intelligencer* of the 28th ult., a review of 'Wheaton's Progress of the Law of Nations in Europe,' translated from the Prussian Gazette for that paper; the editors of which deem it 'interesting to a large portion of their readers,' and especially that part of it relating to perpetual peace,—a question that has been lately a good deal agitated in the political circles of Europe.' The edition of Mr. Wheaton's work referred to in this article, we have not seen; but the reviewer opposes the idea of a general and perpetual peace, and seems to have adopted a theory hostile, in our view, to the dearest interests of humanity. After alluding to three methods which have been suggested, he adds:

'Genz has shown how the idea of a union of all states and of a perpetual peace, though it can never be realized in practice, may nevertheless contribute to perfect the theory of international justice. He has also demonstrated much more conclusively than Hegel, that war is only a relative evil. As in the physical, so in the moral world, the principle of preservation is connected with the principle of destruction. Every new form of existence arises from the destruction of an old.

Life springs anew out of death. Hence the war perpetually waged by the various races of animals against each other, by savage man against the wild beasts, and by civilized man against the savage. The human race finds itself in this situation; it seeks its own preservation and its dominion over the earth by the destruction of others. This extraordinary economy of nature seems a contradictory system, unless we contemplate the universe from an elevated point of view. Pain, destruction and death, are only relative ideas, produced by the peculiar manner in which these changes act upon our sensations. Could we look deeper into the harmony of nature, these mysteries would appear clear, wise, consistent. The perpetual war of nature would then appear only as a proof of her perpetual activity. Man, as a rational being, is, through self-dependence and free-agency, placed above these seeming contradictions of nature. Destruction and death have for him no meaning; his preservation, and that of every thing else that exists, depends on general preservation, and not on general destruction. But man is never an entirely rational being; the warlike instinct, the inimical principle, which sets all nature in motion, lives, moves, and works in him. The rights of every inhabitant of the earth can only be effectually secured against all others by a lawful bond of union. War would not then be entirely banished from the earth, as a cessation of it would require a cessation of those instincts which are in conflict with the supreme dominion of reason; but, at least, there would be the possibility of a condition of things in which no lawful war could take place. The whole earth must become one State, before law can obtain a complete guaranty for its observance among men; but as nature has rendered such a universal State morally impossible, the idea of perpetual peace must be considered a chimera; war, with all its horrors, is the only possible security for a social union among men founded upon law; and however paradoxical the assertion may sound, it is nevertheless an undeniable truth, that WITHOUT WAR THERE WOULD BE NO PEACE ON EARTH.'

All this may be very profound and very interesting to the editors and readers of the *Intelligencer*; but to us it seems a mixture of infidelity, absurdity and nonsense. To represent war among men as arising in the moral world by some law similar to that which, in the physical, connects the principle of preservation with destruction, and which stirs up certain classes of irrational animals against others, is contrary to the plain language of Scripture. To say that 'war is only a relative evil,'—that 'pain, destruction and death, are only relative ideas, produced by the peculiar manner in which these changes act upon our sensations,'—that 'destruction and death have for man no meaning,'—is to speak neither reasonably nor intelligibly. The idea which gleams out from this cloudy paragraph, that Nature has so ordered things as to forbid the least hope of general and perpetual peace, and render war with all its horrors necessary to secure a social union among men founded on law, is one which should be opposed, as contravening alike the interests of humanity, the dictates of reason, and the predictions of the Bible. All war originates in the evil principles or passions of the human breast. Even if justifiable where exclusively defensive and retaliatory, its existence implies that the wrong which renders defence and retaliation a duty, is without excuse. To the nation thus defending itself, it is but a *lesser*, chosen in preference to a *greater evil*; and cannot, with propriety, be held as in its own nature contributing in any sense to the general welfare of mankind. And we add, that words not simply more paradoxical, but more absurd, were never

penned than the concluding ones of the Reviewer,—‘*without war there would be no peace on earth.*’

It is impossible in a single brief article to discuss this great subject. To us, nothing is more obvious, than that peaceful sentiments will spring up and grow in the minds of men, in exact proportion to the progress of knowledge and the influence of Christianity. Nothing could be more reasonable, or more advantageous for nations, than the adoption, by common consent, of some tribunal, to arbitrate between them in case of differences, and the abolition utterly, thereby, of the atrocious custom of war. The fulfilment by such a policy of the beautiful and sublime language of Prophecy, revealing in the future the periods ‘when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more,’ is hardly to be realized until the people of Europe learn more of their rights and interests, and obtain a larger share in their government.

The standing armies, and vast stores of warlike implements and of ammunition, and the naval armaments, maintained by European Potentates, are mighty obstacles to peace; but the people will finally know that these are designed, in most cases, *rather to keep them in subjection than to defend their rights.* Were the population of Europe as enlightened, free, moral, and virtuous as the people of New England, few difficulties, we imagine, would be found in the way of a general and perpetual peace. Voltaire, who was quick to discern the inconsistencies and crimes of Christian nations, having mentioned famine, the plague, and war, as the great evils of the world, and that the *last* comprises and concentrates the other two, says we owe this last (war) ‘*to the fancy of two or three hundred persons, scattered over the surface of the globe, under the name of princes and ministers.*’

It was observed by that lamented friend of Peace (the late Wm. Ladd, Esq.), speaking of a League, or a Coalition of Nations,—‘As to its practicability, whatsoever depends on human volition, is practicable,—what has been done, may be done again,—what now exists on a small scale, may hereafter exist on a larger one.’

The doctrine of the Prussian reviewer may suit the heartless system of European politics, and the more cruel system of an unbaptized and infidel philosophy, but should be utterly reprobated by all American republicans and Christians. We have seen too much of the hand and shared too largely in the beneficence of the Almighty Ruler of nations, to despair of the fortunes of our race. We ask the attention of all good and peaceable men (as Isaac Walton would say) to the following words of that excellent lover of peace, just quoted:

‘There perished, in the wars which followed the French Revolution, five millions and sixty thousand men. Had Christians used as much energy in converting the heathen, as they have in cutting each other’s throats,—had the expenses of the late wars been employed in sending five millions of missionaries to the heathen, after having set them the example of peace at home,—the world would soon be converted to the peaceful religion of Christ.’ ”—*N. Y. Journal of Commerce.*

VOICE OF THE PERIODICAL PRESS.

We earnestly desire to call the attention of the friends of peace to the first articles in the February and March numbers of the Democratic Review, published in New York, entitled, “The Peace Movement,” and “The late William Ladd.” We are sure the perusal of them will